

REMARKS

Claims 27-33 are all the claims pending in the application.

By this Amendment, claims 1-26 and 34-46 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 27 and 30 have been amended for purposes of clarification. The clarifying subject matter added to claims 27 and 30 is supported *at least* by pages 9-10 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,421) in view of Garg (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,603). For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 27

Applicants submit claim 27 is patentable over the references. For example, claim 27 recites an information storage management system *in a first administrative domain administered by a first organization* comprising, *inter alia*, a collection of stored objects and a resource manager, wherein a user sends a request to a resource manager in order to access a protected object, the request including the globally unique identifier (GUID) of the user, and *the resource manager sends a resource manager request to an external storage management system in a second administrative domain administered by a second organization that is different from the first organization*, for information about the user (the request including the GUID again), and *the external storage management system passes the user information of the subject user to the resource manager in response to the resource manager request* from the resource manager. The Examiner alleges that col. 6, lines 5-12 and 28-31, col. 7, lines 35-36, col. 8, lines 15-30, and col.

9, lines 5-37 of Krishnaswamy disclose these features. Applicants respectfully submit that Krishnaswamy does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 27 in as complete detail as set forth in the claim.

Krishnaswamy is directed to a cache-efficient object loader that uses a hash table and an object handle table to load objects, and is designed to take advantage of the caching architecture of processors to improve performance (see Krishnaswamy: Abstract). However, no part of the operations carried out by Krishnaswamy's object loader disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1. For instance, in the portions of Krishnaswamy relied on by the Examiner to reject claim 27, a method of accessing objects is disclosed wherein an application program requests the object loader for an object, wherein the request includes a GUID identifying the object (Krishnaswamy, col. 5, lines 60-63). The object loader performs some internal functions to obtain the memory address of the object, and returns the memory address to the application program (col. 7, lines 36-39).

The internal functions carried out by the object loader include hashing part of the GUID to generate an index, and determining a match for the relevant object entry, and using this information to refer to a field in an object handle table to obtain the memory address of the requested object (Krishnaswamy, col. 5, line 21 - col. 6, line 17). This memory address is transmitted to the requesting application program. Since these operations are carried out *in the object loader itself*, Krishnaswamy does not disclose or suggest a resource manager, which resides in an information storage management system *in a first administrative domain administered by a first organization*, that sends a *resource manager* request to *an external*

storage management system in a second administrative domain administered by a second organization that is different from the first organization, for information about the user (the request including the GUID), and the external storage management system passes the user information of the subject user to the resource manager in response to the resource manager request from the resource manager as set forth in claim 1.

The object loader in Krishnaswamy *does not transmit any requests to an external system seeking information about the application program.* Moreover, the object loader in Krishnaswamy is merely part of a computer system and there is no disclosure or suggestion in Krishnaswamy that the object loader is administered by an organization, let alone the object loader transmitting a request *to an external storage system administered by another organization* for information about the application program.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Krishnaswamy does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

Claims 28-29

Since claims 28-29 depend upon claim 27 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit claims 28-29 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 30

Claim 30 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 27, i.e., claim 30 recites an information storage management system in a first administrative domain

administered by a first organization, “wherein the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, ...the resource manager resolves the globally unique identifier to a user identifier recognized by *an external storage management system in a second administrative domain administered by a second organization that is different from the first organization; the resource manager sending to the external storage management system a resource manager request for information about the user*, the resource manager request including the resolved user identifier” and the resource manager receives a response including user information about the user *from the external storage management system*.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit claim 30 is patentable for *at least* reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 30.

Claims 31-33

Since claims 31-33 depend upon claim 30 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit claims 31-33 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 09/465,514

Attorney Docket No.: A7254

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 14, 2007